

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

SEP 07 2006

Paragraph 1-5 of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 13 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 1 and 13 are
5 rejected under 35 USC §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to
particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as
the invention.

The claims have been amended in such a manner believed to overcome the
objection and the rejection.
10 Withdrawal of the objection and rejection is respectfully requested by the
applicant.

Paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over
15 U.S. Patent Number 6,630,895 to Dong in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,967,831 to
Chuang.

It is respectfully submitted to the Examiner that with respect to the combination,
Dong teaches against the use of touch sensitive keys and further would not require such
as, unlike the applicant, Dong is not concerned with the thinness of the keyboard. To the
20 first point, Dong states:

The USB keyboard 10 comprises a casing (not labeled) having an upper face on
which push buttons 11 are moveably mounted.
Dong, column 2, lines 20-22 (emphasis added). Dong specifically calls for moveably
25 mounted keys which is in direct contradiction to the applicant's claim limitations and the
teachings of Chuang.

As to the second point, Chuang teaches a keyboard that is foldable, and therefore
meant to be as small as possible, and a person seeing the two references, in a vacuum and
without the benefit of the applicant's application, would never find an advantage with
30 combining Chuang with Dong. Dong includes a pivotable display that would not work
with the Chuang device since the Chuang device could not have a recess 21 (as required
by Dong) into which the display could be positioned and still be pocket-sized. Further,

since movable keys are easier to manipulate than touch sensitive keys, one would be directed away from such keyboards. For the above reasons, the combination cannot be anticipated by the prior art references due to lack of motivation and claims 1 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

5 The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Office Action

Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dong in view of Chuang as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 10 Publication 2004/0100447 to Ozolins. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dong in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0100447 to Ozolins.

It is respectfully submitted to the Examiner that Ozolins does not teach an LCD display for displaying video signals received by the computer as claimed by the applicant. 15 As the Examiner has shown, paragraph 0015 of Ozolins discloses touch sensitive keys (though as stated above there is no motivation to make this combination), however, Ozolins generically names the keyboards 'displays' and then states that the display's may be an LCD display.

20 Suitable displays comprise liquid crystal diode (LCD) screen and *associated circuits for controlling the processor(s) and other devices.*

Ozolins, paragraph [0015] (emphasis added). The LCD screen mentioned here is a control peripheral, not a display peripheral for displaying video signals from the computer.

25 As to the foot pads of the applicant's device, Ozolins is also silent on that feature. The Examiner has cited paragraphs 15, 32 and 56 of Ozolins, but each of those references only further describes additional control peripherals mounted on a keyboard for input manipulation. There is no mention of a foot pad anywhere within that reference, or in the other references. The applicant has used foot pads of a resiliently compressible nature to 30 increase friction between the keyboard and a surface on which it is positioned to allow the surface to be angled, with respect to a user, without fear that the keyboard will slide

off of the surface. This element is completely missing from the prior art references and therefore claims 2 and 13 are in condition for allowance over the combination.

With respect to the light emitters, the applicant's light emitters are each positioned adjacent one of the keys to allow each of the keys to be illuminated. Ozolins 5 offers no such teaching. The Ozolins' light emitting diode is an indicator light for indicating the incoming of an audio signal (see paragraph 74) and to show where the microphone is located, not key illumination as taught by the applicant. Further, the applicant teaches the light emitters being positioned within the housing whereas the Ozolins LED is positioned on the keyboard. As a plurality of light emitters positioned 10 within the housing and each being positioned by one of the keys is not found in the prior art, claims 3 and 13 are condition for allowance.

For each of the reasons stated above, claims 1-13 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

15

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 07 2006

CONCLUSION

5

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early consideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

10



Date:

9/7/06

15

Sean A. Kaufhold (Reg. No. 46,820)
P.O. Box 89626
Sioux Falls, SD 57109
(605) 334-1571 FAX (605) 334-1574